

# **Interview Summary**

Application No.

10/696,487

Applicant(s)

BUCHHOLZ ET AL.

Examiner

Susan Ungar

Art Unit

1642

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Susan Ungar.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Gene Yao.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 January 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed patentable material. Claim 1 would appear to be allowable upon amendment of the claim to delete the term UKW and substitute therefore the phrase "SEQ ID NO:1", claim 2 would appear to be allowable upon amendment of claim 2, as follows, after "the same species used", delete the remaining language within the claim and substitute therefore, "wherein the sample is assayed with a probe consisting of (i) SEQ ID NO:1 or a fragment thereof, said fragment consisting of a nucleotide sequence comprising 50 contiguous nucleotides of SEQ ID NO:1; (ii) a nucleic acid consisting of a polynucleotide which is 100% complementary to said probe; wherein determination of approximately 15 fold to approximately 60 fold greater level of SEQ id no:1 in the test sample compared to the second sample, indicates that the sample contains pancreatic cancer cells, wherein claim 3 is canceled, claim 13 is canceled, claim 16 is amended to be dependent upon claim 2, claim 17 is canceled. Applicant will get back to Examiner by COB on 1/16.